

than to take care of the veterans of today. The 110th Congress has made the needs of veterans a priority and I rise in support of several pieces of veterans legislation that passed the House of Representatives on May 20, 2008.

Too many veterans and their families suffer economically as a result of injury or disability that occurred during service. The Veterans Cost of Living Adjustment Act (H.R. 5826) ensures that veterans disability payments and dependency and indemnity compensation for veterans' families keep up with inflation.

Those soldiers that are injured during war deserve affordable and quality medical treatment when they return home. The Veterans Emergency Care Fairness Act (H.R. 3819) allows veterans to be reimbursed for receiving emergency treatment in non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities. Also, the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Authorization and Lease Act (H.R. 5856) authorizes vital improvement and expansions to VA hospitals and clinics around the country.

According to the 2007 National Survey on Drug Use and Health, approximately 1.9 million veterans suffer from diagnosable substance abuse. The Veterans Substance Use Disorders Prevention and Treatment Act (H.R. 5554) funds drug screening, detoxification, relapse prevention and counseling for veterans. It also creates an online pilot program that provides treatment to Iraq and Afghanistan war veterans for substance abuse.

Finally, the Veterans Benefits Awareness Act (H.R. 3681) helps veterans and their families learn about available government services. The VA will now be able to advertise in the national media in order to reach out to more veterans about homeless assistance, healthcare benefits, mental health services, educational and vocational opportunities, and other benefits.

I want to thank Speaker PELOSI, Chairman FILNER, and my colleagues for passing these important and vital bills to help veterans and their families.

#### EARMARK DECLARATION

#### HON. KENNY C. HULSHOF

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 2008

Mr. HULSHOF. Madam Speaker, I submit the following:

Requesting Member: Congressman KENNY HULSHOF.

Bill Number: H.R. 5658, Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009.

Account: Research, Development, Test and Evaluation (RDT&E), Aviation Advanced Technology.

Legal Name of Requesting Entity: Westar Aerospace & Defense Group, Inc., 4 Research Park Drive, St. Charles, MO 63304-5685; On behalf of: Aeromechanics Division, AMSRD-AMR-AE-A, Aviation Engineering Directorate, Bldg 4488 Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-5000.

Address of Requesting Entity: Westar Aerospace & Defense Group, Inc., 4 Research Park Drive, St. Charles, MO 63304-5685; Aeromechanics Division, AMSRD-AMR-AE-A, Aviation Engineering Directorate, Bldg 4488, Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898-5000.

Description of Request: To provide \$10 million in funding to continue the development of

integrated Aviation tools and provide this ability to all Army Aviation systems to include UH-60 series, OH-58D, AH-64D), Fixed Wing and UAS systems. The complete integrated aviation solution includes implementing the automated maintenance test flight tool, automated weight and balance software, and integration with current logistics and Aviation Mission Planning systems. These products are urgently needed by combat units in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, and will result in significant increases in mission effectiveness and safety for our warfighters. These tools will be used by our military's aircraft operators to greatly improve their effectiveness and situational awareness, which will improve support to the warfighter from materiel developers.

#### THE CORRECT APPROACH TO GLOBALIZATION

#### HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 22, 2008

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, the overriding economic issue confronting our country is the task of proceeding with the increased globalization of the economy in a manner that promotes an equitable distribution of the benefits. For too many years, until fairly recently, there was a consensus supported by many in the academic and business establishments that argued that concern about the distribution of the benefits of globalization was unnecessary at best and disruptive at worst, and that if we simply proceeded with greater openness, in trade, in the freeing of capital from any restraints, and in other ways, we would all be better off.

It is now indisputable that this is not the case, and that growth has proceeded in the U.S.—and in some other parts of the world—in recent years in a manner that has increased both wealth and inequality. Of course it is the case that in a capitalist system, some inequality is necessary for the economy to function. But we have seen inequality grow far beyond what is either productive or, in the minds of many of us, morally justifiable. Many of us have argued to people in the business community that the resentment that is being generated—very legitimately—by this increased inequality has become an obstacle to the adoption of policies that they think are in our national interest. Many of us, including I believe the leadership on economic issues of the Democratic Party here in the House, believe that we should proceed with globalization in a reasonable and orderly way, but accompanied by policies that offset its tendencies to increase inequality, erode environmental standards, and promote reckless deregulation. Recently, former Treasury Secretary Larry Summers wrote interesting articles in the Financial Times strongly arguing that such a position is both necessary and achievable. In the Financial Times of May 21, Martin Wolf, a very thoughtful economic commentator, makes a further important contribution to this debate. The movement from an unqualified cheer for globalization without any concern for its negative consequences on substantial numbers of Americans to a thoughtful discussion of how to go forward with the economic integration of

the world in a socially useful manner is a very welcome one. Martin Wolf's contribution to that debate in the Financial Times is therefore very important and I ask that it be printed here.

[From the Financial Times, May 21, 2008]

#### HOW TO PRESERVE THE OPEN ECONOMY AT A TIME OF STRESS

(By Martin Wolf)

Is the spread of prosperity in the interests of citizens of today's high-income countries? Is globalisation of their economies in their interest?

These distinct questions are raised in my mind by two important columns from Lawrence Summers ("America needs to make a new case for trade" on April 27 and "A strategy to promote healthy globalisation" on May 4). In these, Mr. Summers argues that the international economic policies of the U.S. need to be coupled more closely to the interests of its workers. Many Europeans will concur.

This is not to argue that the interests of citizens of high-income countries are more important than those of others. On the contrary, the view that increases in incomes of the poor offset equivalent losses for the rich is morally compelling. But politics is national. Unless or until a global political community emerges, politics will respond only to perceptions of national interest.

So is the rising prosperity of China, India and other emerging economies in the interests of today's high-income countries? The correct answer to this is: not necessarily. It would be absurd to pretend otherwise.

The big advantages of the spread of prosperity include a wider distribution of innovation and bigger opportunities for profitable exchange. The rise of the U.S. brought such benefits to the U.K. Also valuable (though not certain) is greater political stability in previously impoverished countries.

The big disadvantage is greater competition for scarce resources. Power is a scarce resource: if country A has more, country B has less. Resources are also limited. If commodity prices rise, the terms of trade (the relative prices of exports and imports) of net importers will deteriorate: countries have to sell more exports to obtain given imports.

Since the end of 2001, U.S. terms of trade have deteriorated by an eighth, as commodity prices have soared and the currency devalued. This has turned an 18 per cent increase in real gross domestic product between the last quarter of 2001 and the fourth quarter of 2008 into a 16.4 per cent increase in real national income. The difference is not huge. But it is worth some \$220bn in today's dollars. So countries may indeed be harmed by the prosperity of others. (See charts).

The answer to this is: so what? As Willem Buiter has pointed out (Economic Internationalism 101, Maverecon, May 5), nothing can be done to halt the diffusion of "knowledge, skills, technology, management systems" and so forth. Or at least nothing rational or decent can be done. Of course, the U.S. could launch an unprovoked blockade or even war against China or India. To mention such ideas is to reveal their strategic and moral bankruptcy.

The U.S. could, it is true, try to halt the flow of ideas. The U.K. tried to halt the spread of technology to the U.S. in the early 19th century: it failed. The Chinese empire once made it a capital crime to export silkworms: that failed, too. Similarly, protectionism against the emerging countries might slow their growth, but would not halt it. Yet it would guarantee a breakdown in international relations that threatened hopes of a peaceful future.

To repeat, nothing can be done about the rise of emerging countries, as they follow the

lead of the west. What cannot be helped must be accepted. This takes us to my second question. Given the rise of the emerging world, should the developed world limit the globalisation of its own economies? Of course, so long as high-income countries depend on imports of commodities, trade will be essential. Self-sufficiency is a mirage. It is a question rather of how much openness to trade and movement of capital and labour there should be.

One issue has been the huge current account deficits of the U.S. Yet these are at last contracting, as export growth explodes (see chart).

On trade more narrowly, the basic point is well known: free trade is in the interests of the country adopting the policy, unless it has monopoly power. But—an important “but”—the benefits and costs are likely to be unevenly distributed. The latter is particularly likely for trade between rich and poor countries. Free movement of capital or labour may also harm important interest groups within a country even if it raises aggregate incomes. The freer movement becomes, the harder it may also be to impose taxes and regulations on those able to move.

As Mr. Summers argues, it is hard for a democracy to proceed with policies that a large minority believes are against their interests. If the fall-back position is not to be protectionism, itself no more than an inefficient tax and subsidy programme, more creative options must be chosen. The most obvious point, at least for the U.S. is the need to shift the provision of security from employers to the state. Corporate welfare states are unsustainable in a dynamic and open economy.

Yet if the U.S. is to have a more generous welfare state, including universal health provision, as in every other high-income country, taxes will have to be raised. Indeed, they will have to be raised even to meet existing commitments. Mr. Summers argues, in response, for international action against harmful tax competition. He argues, too, for greater international agreement on regulation. In some areas, notably finance, the latter makes sense. But the view that the U.S. must obtain such agreements if it is to raise some of the lowest levels of taxation and weakest regulation in the advanced world is unpersuasive. If Sweden's taxes can be 56 per cent of GDP, it is not tax competition that keeps the U.S. at just 34 percent. The mobility of capital and people is an excuse, not a justification, for low U.S. tax levels.

What is desperately needed is an honest debate about these issues. Such a debate would, I believe, reach four fundamental conclusions. First, whether or not citizens of the U.S. (or other high-income countries) welcome it, the global spread of economic development is ineluctable. Second, protection against imports is a costly and ineffective way of dealing with the consequences. Third, parties of the centre-left should argue for redistributing the spoils of globalisation, not sacrificing them. Finally, a necessary condition is higher taxation of the winners. But the chief obstacle to that is a lack of domestic political will. Globalisation is not a reason for low taxes, but an excuse. It should be discarded.

Everybody should remember, above all, that the opening of the world economy is the west's greatest economic policy achievement. It would be a tragedy if it were to turn its back on the world when the rest of humanity is at last turning towards it.

# INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION HONORING THE LIFE OF DR. VICTOR WESTPHALL AND MRS. JEANNE WESTPHALL AND THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE NATION'S VETERANS

## HON. TOM UDALL

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 2008*

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, I rise today to proudly introduce legislation in tribute to Dr. Victor Westphall and Mrs. Jeanne Westphall, who dedicated their lives to honoring the courage and sacrifice of their fallen son, LT Victor David Westphall III, USMC, and all Vietnam veterans.

Following the tragic deaths of their son and 15 of his fellow Marines, on May 22, 1968, in Vietnam—40 years ago today—Dr. and Mrs. Westphall led the Nation in memorializing all Vietnam veterans by building an enduring symbol of the tragedy of war. In late summer of 1968, the Westphalls began construction of the Vietnam Veteran's Peace and Brotherhood Chapel in Angel Fire, New Mexico, in honor of their son and his fallen comrades. The chapel was completed in 1971 and dedicated on May 22nd that same year—37 years ago today—which was the third anniversary of David's heroic death. Ultimately, it was the Westphall's hope that the memorial would serve as a source of inspiration for all in pursuit of a peaceful world.

At a time of political unrest in a deeply divided Nation, constructing the memorial was not a popular idea, but Dr. and Mrs. Westphall persevered. Their strength and courage triumphed in the face of financial difficulties by being the first to commemorate those who had suffered, and those who had died in the war. Needless to say, the chapel's message has since become widespread and its message has been followed by many. The chapel is a place of peace and tranquility and has become a spiritual haven for reflection. Its doors have never been locked, and for many it represents serenity, nobility, and comfort for all.

The memorial is recognized as a monument of national significance and embodies the harmony and solace of Angel Fire's landscape and New Mexico's citizenry. The substantial financial and emotional contributions made by Dr. and Mrs. Westphall represent their efforts to honor all veterans and to properly memorialize the sacrifices made during the Vietnam war. In 2005, the David Westphall Veterans Foundation donated the memorial to the State of New Mexico and it is now officially the Vietnam Veterans Memorial State Park—the only State park in the United States dedicated solely as a Vietnam veterans memorial. New Mexico State Parks plans to maintain and improve the Memorial and stay true to its purpose as a place of healing and education.

The memorial plays a large role in helping to heal the wounds of the Vietnam war. It helps bring us together not only to remember what occurred and what was lost, but also to ensure that we do not forget. In keeping with the traditions of all that Dr. Victor Westphall, Mrs. Jeanne Westphall, their son, and their family stood for, please join me in proudly recognizing them with this legislation.

# RENEWABLE ENERGY AND JOB CREATION ACT OF 2008

SPEECH OF

## HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, May 21, 2008*

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6049, the Renewable Energy and Job Creation Act. This legislation will extend and expand tax incentives for renewable energy and create hundreds of thousands of green jobs, along with providing critical tax relief to families as they face rising gas and food costs.

With soaring gas prices hitting our constituents hard in the pocket book, we need to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, while protecting the environment. H.R. 6049 does this by increasing production of renewable fuels and renewable electricity, and encouraging greater energy efficiency. Specifically, the 6-year extension of the investment tax credit for solar energy, the 3-year extension of the production tax credit for biomass-, geothermal-, and hydropower-generated energy, and the 1-year extension of the production tax credit for energy derived from wind set us on the right path for decreasing our dependence on foreign oil.

This bill would also provide critical tax relief to families at a time when they are paying more at the pump and in the grocery store. When passed, this bill would provide this relief through the ability to deduct State and local sales tax, tuition and other education expenses including the out-of-pocket expenses by teachers, the deduction of property taxes for non-itemizers and probably most importantly, relief for more than 12 million children through an expansion of the refundable child taxpayers earning \$8,500 a year. These are commonsense items directed towards those who are in the most need of relief. It is no secret that the cost of living is increasing and wages are stagnant. These provisions will help the average American family receive some relief.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to support the Renewable Energy and Job Creation Act and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

# TRIBUTE TO THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

## HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, May 22, 2008*

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call attention to a potentially serious liver disease that affects a growing number of young people in our society and to commend an outstanding research program that the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases (NIDDK), a unit of the National Institutes of Health, is conducting to address it before it creates a major crisis for our population.

I am referring to Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease, NAFLD. While the name is unwieldy, the concerns are real. We are all aware of the growing epidemic of obesity in young people and the impact that this can have on increased incidence of diabetes, heart disease,